

IN THE DRAWINGS:

Attached are Replacement Sheet of Figs. 1 and 2 along with newly added Fig. 10.

REMARKS

Claims 1-8 and 16-24 are in this application and are presented for reconsideration. By this Amendment, Applicant has amended Claims 1-8 and 16-24, and made various minor changes to the specification, drawings and claims to highlight the important combination of features which define over the prior art of record. Claims 9-15 and 25-31 remain withdrawn from consideration.

Applicant thanks the Examiner for the careful reading of the application, and for providing suggestions. It is Applicant's position that the specification and amended claims are clear and definite.

By this Amendment, the Applicant has amended the specification and several claims to overcome the Examiner's rejections and respectfully makes assertions for overcoming the rejections of the outstanding Office Action dated January 6, 2006 in the following paragraphs.

Specification

The disclosure has been objected to because the brief description of the drawing of Fig. 9 is missing.

In response, Applicant has amended the pertinent paragraph to overcome this objection.

Drawing Objection under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a)

The drawings have been objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) for failing to show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Specifically, the objection notes that the "LED bulbs made from a number of LED wafers" of claims 5 and 21 must be shown or the features canceled from the claims.

In response, Applicant has added the FIG. 10 which now shows an LED made from a wafer. It is Applicant's position that several of these wafers can create several LED bulbs.

Further, the objection states that FIG. 1 should be designated by a legend such as --Prior Art--.

Applicant has taken heed of the suggestion and thanks the Examiner for the helpful suggestion.

Claim Objections

Claims 6 and 22 have been objected to for lack of antecedent basis for "the external part of said function type illumination device".

Applicant has amended claims 6 and 22 to overcome this objection.

Claim 8 has been objected to and Office suggests changing "string lamp" to -string lamps- for consistency.

Applicant has amended claim 8 according to the suggestion.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-20 and 22-24 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102 as being anticipated by the U.S. Pat. No. 5,379,202 to Daun (the "Daun '202" reference, hereinafter). This rejection is based on the Office position that the Daun '202 reference discloses all of the elements of claims 1-4, 6-8, 16-20 and 22-24.

The prior art as a whole including the Daun '202 reference neither teaches nor suggests the present invention as claimed. The Daun '202 reference discloses an animated light display, with an animated decorative part having a series of successive display elements, each display element partially overlapping an adjacent display element along the series. The display also includes a plurality of string sets of electric lights supported on the display elements and a control means for simulating animation of the decorative part by sequentially illuminating the sets of lights on the display elements in succession, only one set of lights being illuminated at any one time while all the other sets of lights are maintained extinguished.

The present invention differs on at least several grounds from the prior art of the Daun '202 reference. First, the present invention provide for at least two different types of illuminant devices. One type is the basic illuminant type with a basic illuminant component. The other type is a function type illuminant device. This function type illuminant device includes a default control device. The Daun '202 reference only discusses one type of light that is all controlled by one single controller located away from the lights themselves.

Second important difference of the present invention is that the controller for the function type device is actually provided inside the lamp holder or the lamp base. The Daun

'202 reference clearly shows that its controller 34 is outside the base of each light.

Third important difference of the present invention is that each individual controller for each function type illuminant device allows a pre-determined set of lights to light up. In other words, the controller selectively illuminates its function type illuminant component only or it may illuminate the function type illuminant component with a set of basic illuminant components. For instance, as mentioned in the specification, only a single Santa Claus eye in the midst of a series of lights, could light up with distinctive lighting feature. Thus, even through the insulated wire connects both the basic lamp holder and the function type lamp holder in series or in parallel, function type lamp holder illuminates on its own regardless of the basic lamp holder.

Fourth important difference between the present invention and the Daun '202 reference is that due to the special feature of the present invention, the controller is able to display lights in a preset radial transition mode and a pre-determined decorative effect distinct from a basic illuminant mode of the basic illuminant devices.

Applicant further notes that the Daun '202 reference does not provide any suggestion or motivation which would lead a person of ordinary skill in the art to believe that such controller is embedded inside its light sets. Instead, Daun '202 leads a person of ordinary skill in the art to an ordinary light structure, completely different from the present invention as claimed. Dependent claims 2-4, 6-8, 16, 18-20, and 22-24 depend on the independent claims 1 and 17 respectively and also include the combination of features which define over the prior art. Therefore, the Daun '202 reference neither teaches nor suggests the present invention as

claimed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103

Claims 5 and 21 have been rejected as being obvious over Daun '202 reference in view of the U.S. Pat. No. 6,971,765 to Wu (the "Wu '765" reference, hereinafter). The Office admits that the Daun '202 reference does not disclose bulb made from a number of LED wafers, and relies on the Wu '765 reference to show this feature to conclude that it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the lamp bulb for purpose of providing an advantageous way of controlling light effect.

It is Applicant's position that claims 5 and 21 are not obvious in view of the Daun '202 reference and the Wu '765 reference. The present invention as claimed provides for a combination of features not taught by the prior art as a whole including the above references. For instance, there are several differences for the present invention as claimed as mentioned above.

Additionally, there must be some suggestion or teaching in the prior art as a whole which would lead the person of ordinary skill in the art to provide the combination as claimed. As the prior art as a whole fails to direct the person of ordinary skill in the art toward the claimed combination, the invention should be considered not anticipated, non-obvious and thus patentable.

Furthermore, Applicant finds no incentive in Wu '765 reference which would lead a person to all the structural features of the controller in the base with the set having two

different types of illuminat devices altogether. Claims 5 and 21 therefore cannot be obvious in view of Wu '765 reference.

Therefore, Applicant finds that the Daun '202 reference in view of the Wu '765 reference does not anticipate the current invention and there is no suggestion or motivation to use the teachings of the references to provide the combination as claimed.

As the prior art fails to suggest the combination of features as claimed, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner favorably consider the claims as now presented in view of the amended claims and in view of the discussion above. Applicant respectfully solicits allowance of this application.

It is applicant's position that all claims are now allowable. Should the Examiner determine that issues remain that have not been resolved by this response, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicant's representative at the number listed below.

Favorable action is requested.

Respectfully submitted
for Applicant,

By: 

D. W. Darren Kang
Reg. No. 51,859

JJM/DWK:
71331.6

SHOULD ANY OTHER FEE BE REQUIRED, THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE IS HEREBY REQUESTED TO CHARGE SUCH FEE TO OUR DEPOSIT ACCOUNT 13-0410.

CERTIFICATE OF FACSIMILE TRANSMISSION

I HEREBY CERTIFY THAT THIS PAPER FOR SERIAL NO. 10/789,080 (20 PAGES IN ALL) IS BEING FACSIMILE TRANSMITTED TO THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE FACSIMILE NUMBER 571-273-8300 ON THE DATE SHOWN BELOW.

D. W. Darren Kang

NAME OF PERSON SIGNING CERTIFICATION



SIGNATURE

DATED: April 5, 2006
McGLEW AND TUTTLE, P.C.
BOX 9227 SCARBOROUGH STATION
SCARBOROUGH, NEW YORK 10510-9227
TELEPHONE: (914) 941-5600
FACSIMILE: (914) 941-5855